

On June 10, 1965, the Special Committee composed of ex Chairmen of the Executive Committee of the University Senate and inaugurated by the following resolution:

That the Faculty Assembly appoint a committee consisting of Professor Reuben E. Wood, Chairman, and Professors Wolfgang H. Kraus and Roderic H. Davison, former chairmen of the Executive Committee of the University Senate, to ascertain the facts in all cases in which the Board of Trustees has not seen fit or do not see fit to follow the recommendations of the Faculty Assembly or the University Senate and, with all reasonable speed to report its findings and recommendations to the Faculty Assembly."

passed at the Special Meeting of the Faculty Assembly on June 7, 1965, met in Bacon Hall. Mr. Kraus, Mr. Wood and Mr. J. Forrester Davison (who is substituting for Roderic H. Davison, on leave) were present. The purpose of the meeting was to receive from Mr. Arthur Miller, member of the Special Committee to Advise and Consult with the Board of Trustees on the Selection of a President, his own recollections and impressions of the series of events leading to the selection of Dr. Elliott as President of the University by the Board of Trustees at its meeting on June 5th, 1965, which selection was contrary to the recommendations of the Special Committee of the Faculty.

Upon being questioned on various points, Mr. Miller made the following responses; which were to the best of his recollection.

1. That as far as he knew, no written confirmation of the criteria set up by the Special Faculty Committee existed as far as the Board of Trustees' acceptance was concernedsimply a matter of good faith.
2. That as far as he knew, a separate file of each candidate who had reached the interview stage either at The George Washington University or on his own campus, existed.
3. That the oral report given by Dr. Brown at the Faculty Assembly meeting had not been cleared with him. All previous reports were written and were a joint effort. He had been told he would be asked to get together with Dr. Brown to draft the report, but he had not been asked. Upon being asked if he requested Dr. Brown meet with him about it, he said he had not done so.
4. Professor Miller stated that he hoped that the final report of the Committee would recommend the formation of two committees and a sub-committee as it had been difficult to arrange meetings of the full Faculty Committee right along. There had been no "routine getting together that he would have liked to have seen. Many of the decisions had been reached by means of a sort of "treaty" among themselves.
5. Upon being asked if Dr. Brown had any formal statement of his remarks, at the meeting, Mr. Miller said he understood that Dr. Brown had "some kind of tape" in his office which could be transcribed if necessary. Asked if anyone else on the Committee had been in contact with Dr. Brown, Mr. Miller said "not as far as he knew." "After our meeting with the Board on Saturday, he was to call me about what would be in the report."
6. When asked about Dr. Brown and Professor's Schmidt's attendance at the Board Meeting alone, Mr. Miller stated that Mr. Hughes, a member of the Board, had invited "any number" to come but also mentioned there was not a great deal of room. Dr. Brown and Professor Schmidt then represented the Committee.

7. Mr. Miller stated that contact with Dr. Elliott began on May 28, 1965 when the Faculty Committee met him for lunch. The lunch lasted about two hours" with much talk back and forth. He answered (Dr. Elliott) frankly any questions put to him and various people made comments. This was the only meeting the Committee had with Dr. Elliott himself. Mr. Miller accompanied Mr. Elliott to "Straus" office (member of the Board who could not attend the meeting that day, but who wished to meet Dr. Elliott) and then accompanied him back to the Board meeting. They met President Colclough on the way and Dr. Elliott left with him and Mr. Miller returned to his office.

8. Asked who really seemed to be the person who first recommended Dr. Elliott to the Board, Mr. Miller said it was his impression that he was recommended to Mr. Ellison by John Gardner, President of the Carnegie Foundation. Mr. Hughes (Board member) met Dr. Elliott in New York. Mr. Miller does not know the dates of these events. Mr. Hughes said he would bring it(sic) to the attention of the full committee.

9. Mr. Miller says the Faculty Committee did not meet on the 28th or 29th of May. They did decide on a meeting around that time that two people (Mr. William Schmidt and Dr. Thomas McP. Brown) should go to the University of Maine campus.

10. Asked about finances for these trips, Mr. Miller stated the University has set up a budget for the Committee which later included money for a Secretary.

11. Dr. Brown and Mr. Schmidt went to Maine on Tuesday, June 1, came back on Wednesday, June 2, met the Faculty Committee on Thursday, June 3rd and gave the Committee a full report. "At that time, I told them that in my judgment, they had not made a persuasive case against him or for him." The report was "mixed."

12. Asked what Mr. Miller thought were some positive things about Dr. Elliott which would off-set the negative points, Mr. Miller mentioned that he was very good at legislative matters, alumni relations and student relations. He had increased the budget, had added a new Law School (at Portland). Another factor was that he had an excellent record for getting money from the State Legislature in Maine. He had done some excellent work in getting money from corporate sources. He had gotten six endowed chairs since he has been at Maine.

13. Two things were contrary: 1) One that he made two "unsuitable" appointments at the Maine campus. One was a Dean of Graduate Studies, which caused a great deal of concern. This happened about five years ago, however, ~~and the Dean is no longer there.~~ A Faculty Organization Plan has been set up at Maine which is more "stringent" than at The George Washington University. 2) He was termed "a land grant college type" which apparently inferred that his experience at a small college would not "transfer well" to a University such as this.

Asked about whether this lack of transferability was based on his "stepping up of enrollment with no corresponding development of the Faculty, Mr. Miller replied he did not recall. Dr. Brown and Mr. Schmidt would have that information, he thought.

14. Asked about Dr. Elliott's relationships with the Faculty, Mr. Miller stated that Mr. Schmidt had indicated that a large majority of the Faculty would be sorry to see him go. He said a majority (of 16 or 17) would be sorry to see him go and that is why he remembered this statement.

15. Asked about Dr. Elliott's statement that "the President and the Faculty are the hired hands; the Board of Trustees is the boss," Mr. Miller replied that although he had made the statement at the luncheon attended by the Faculty Committee, it had been in the course of a conversation. He had not been asked to explain it. He had

also stated that he would, if elected, "put the Board of Trustees to work" in order that the Board would be identified with particular projects. It was Mr. Miller's opinion that the statement was not meant in the "stark and invidious" manner in which he had been quoted. He should simply be asked to explain it when he has a meeting with the Faculty.

16. When asked what Dr. Elliott's views of University Objectives were, Mr. Miller replied that Dr. Elliott felt he was not familiar enough with the University to really comment meaningfully at that time.

Mr. Miller then outlined the series of events leading to the Board of Trustees' final selection of Dr. Elliott.

We met with the Board Committee on Friday, June 4, at which time they stated that they were going to make a recommendation to the Board on June 5, at which time we made our committee statement on Elliott. Upon a motion made by Mr. Walker, that we disapprove of Dr. Elliott, seven (7) were in favor and three (3) abstained.

If there was to be a chance in the Acting President, we recommended John A. Brown. Mr. Miller spoke to Vice President Brown who was asked if he wished to be mentioned in this way, and Mr. Brown said he "willing to run the risk." Mr. Brown further stated that if he were to be made Acting President, we should convey to the Board his willingness to continue the search for someone of the calibre of Harry Ransom. (He only had 10 minutes with Perkins) We never took a vote on whether or not he was qualified.

Our Committee met with the Board Committee on Friday, June 4, gave two recommendations to them, one on Elliott and one on Brown (7-1/2 abstentions).

Ellison asked were these unanimous? One of the trustees stated: "I like Elliott better than Perkins." I made a statement at this meeting that "the man (Elliott) ^{does not seem to} did not have the stature." ^{at this time} I thought we should look for a man like Perkins. I repeated the statements I made earlier to Dr. Brown and Mr. Schmidt on their visit to Maine. I repeated my statement that "I did not think they had made a convincing case against Dr. Elliott to show he was not the man for the job. They did not make a convincing case to me and certainly not to the Board."

On Friday, we were told by Mr. Ellison that they were unanimous on the point that John A. Brown would not become President of the University. (and were quite emotional about it.)

They told us on Saturday, they were unanimous on Elliott. We asked to attend the Board meeting and were refused. They later returned to ask us. This was the meeting to which Dr. Brown and Mr. Schmidt went alone.

Asked about a letter rumored to have been sent by the Chairman of the Board to other members of the Board on June 3 that "everyone should unite behind Elliott," Mr. Miller said he thought Mr. Morris, the new Chairman would be the best person to ask about this. He added that the Special Committee should find out "why the Board wanted this man). (By the Special Committee mentioned here, Mr. Miller was referring to the Committee of Inquiry who were now questioning him.)

I made this statement (Several had made) in a meeting of Faculty Committee
afterwards meeting
with the trustees

After some brief discussion of Mr. Ransom, and how he had decided to withdraw his name, a short talk about the memorandum of the deans and chairmen to the Board of Trustees, Mr. Miller indicated that in his opinion, Mr. Ellison was becoming "sick and tired" of the whole matter and consequently it was decided that they would settle upon Dr. Elliott.

A short further discussion ensued and Mr. Miller had to leave for another meeting and the present meeting adjourned until tomorrow, June 11, at 12 noon.

Mr. Wood
R. Brown

The Committee of Inquiry met at 12 Noon, June 11, 1965, Mr. Reuben Wood, Mr. Wolfgang Kraus and Mr. J. Forrester Davison attending. The purpose of the meeting was to resume getting the background of the Board of Trustees selection of Dr. Elliott for President of The George Washington University from the standpoint of the Faculty Committee to Advise and Consult with the Board of Trustees to the best of Mr. Arthur Miller's recollections.

Asked what he believed was the motivating force behind the deans and chairmen's recommendations of Mr. John A. Brown, as evidenced in their memoranda of May 7-8 and June 1 1965, Mr. Miller replied "He would not know."

In reply to a question about the continued objectivity of the Faculty Committee, Mr. Miller stated that in his opinion, ~~that~~ the Committee's objectivity "broke down" during the last three or four weeks. ~~He presented as evidence of his feelings a copy of a memorandum which he had written to the Faculty Committee on May 28th but which he had not sent.~~

Asked if he thought that such a breakdown in objectivity had influenced the Committee's vote, not to recommend Dr. Elliott, he replied he could not really say. He stated that he wished to make another point which was to say that in his opinion only, the Committee should be criticized for its failure to produce feasible candidates after Dr. Courtland Perkins had expressed his unwillingness to take the position. It was his own opinion that Mr. John A. Brown had not had a chance to "get by the Board" for months. An effort had been made to recommend Mr. Harlan Cleveland but Mr. Ellison stated it would be impossible for various reasons. Mr. Cleveland was the only other candidate produced after Perkins' statement of unavailability, around the middle or last part of April.

Asked by Mr. Wood about the differences of opinion about why Mr. Miller was not present at the meeting of May 8th which culminated in the first memoranda of the Deans to the Board of Trustees, re Mr. John A. Brown's candidacy, Mr. Miller stated that to the best of his recollection, the first thing he heard about it was when Mr. Stevens called him and stated that the meeting was going on in Dean Linton's office and he asked him to come. Mr. Miller stated that he did not think the Committee should be present, that he would not attend, but that he would furnish the names and telephone numbers of the other members of the Committee who might choose to go. No one called him back about the telephone numbers.

Mr. Miller stated in response to a question about how the Board came to make its decision on Dr. Elliott, that in his opinion, the pressures which had built up in recent weeks on the part of the Faculty Committee on the one hand and the group of Deans and Chairman on the other had caused the Board to take the action it had. He stated further that he did not know what caused the Board to choose Mr. Elliott in the first place but he felt the Faculty was entitled to ask the Board its reasons. He thought perhaps Mr. Hughes (a Trustee) who had first met Mr. Elliott in New York, or Mr. Phillips (another Trustee) might be inclined to talk with the Faculty Inquiry Committee.

In response to an inquiry from Mr. Davison as to what extent he thought the Faculty Committee would have accomplished more if it had been more formally arranged as to Chairman and Secretary, Mr. Miller stated that both Committees (the Faculty Committee and the Board Committee) were too large. He thought a sub-committee of perhaps two members of the Faculty and two members of the Board would be a wise move. He thought a less formal relationship between the Faculty and the Board should be established, to "sort of negotiate treaties."

In reply to a question about whether or not the Trustees really had enough time to spend on questions like this as would be preferred, Mr. Miller said the Board of

Trustees did not know as much about the University itself as it should and could not, therefore, be as close to the problems as the Faculty.

Asked if the Board Committee felt "at ease" with members of the Faculty Committee, Mr. Miller stated that they were always ready to talk things out. At the same time that Mr. Ransom came into the picture, the Faculty Committee said they "would take Perkins" for the reasons that he was younger, had a grasp of Washington affairs, etc. All the deans and Mr. Ellison wanted Ransom (they were highly pleased with him.) "We were able to get across that Perkins should be the man sounded out."

In a discussion of how the Trustees might be able to see some of the viewpoints of the Faculty, Mr. Miller suggested that they should walk around the campus, see things at first hand. He mentioned that President Carroll had instituted a plan to have several members of the Faculty attend a Board Meeting occasionally. This, he thought, was a nice gesture but he also felt they should have been asked only when they had something substantive to say. "Most times they do not have." He said at one time President Carroll had asked the faculties of the various schools and colleges to outline their particular needs and suggest a plan for meeting them and later the President stated that he had only one real plan (from the Law School) on his desk. Mr. Miller stated that he did not think faculty members should be members of the Board. He thought the Board should speak publicly on various problems such as subsidized football deficits and like matters.

Queried on the visit of Mr. Schmidt and Dr. Brown to the Maine Campus, Mr. Miller stated that Mr. Ellison knew someone was going but not the exact date. It was the usual custom to do this as they had in the Perkins matter, and had been requested not to do in the Ransom matter. Mr. Ellison when told they were going at some time, said, "Fine, as long as they were discreet about it."

Mr. Miller stated that he had lunch with Mr. John A. Brown on June 4, 1965. The Committee had heard reports that Mr. Brown would accept the Acting Presidency if it were offered. Mr. Brown authorized him to tell the Committee at its meeting that he would accept. Mr. Miller made the motion that if there were to be a change in the acting presidency that the Committee should recommend Mr. Brown. The motion passed 7-1 with 2 abstentions. Mr. Miller said he did not know what the motives of the abstainers were. He felt that if the search were to continue, the University should have younger, more energetic leadership. He felt the burden was too heavy for the present Acting President.

Asked if he thought the Committee felt pressure was being brought to bear to make Mr. Brown President, he replied "Yes, by the Committee and by the deans and the department chairmen. *Some members of*"

In a discussion of the deans and department chairmen's meeting to which Mr. Miller said he was invited by Mr. Stevens when the meeting was in progress, the point was made that Dr. Thomas McP. Brown stated he was attending not as a member of the Faculty Committee but rather as Chairman of a department in the Medical School. Mr. Miller reiterated his opinion that this meeting "seriously undercut" the work of the Faculty Committee whether or not it was intended to "reinforce" the Faculty Committee. It set up another group of people dealing with the Trustees on a different set of signals.

Asked if the Committee had taken any previous vote upon Mr. Brown's candidacy, Mr. Miller stated that at a Faculty Committee meeting on May 8, the Committee had voted 7-3 against presenting Mr. Brown's name as a recommended candidate alone. His name was included with two others, one of whom was Harlan Cleveland. (memo dated May 10) (The dean's meeting was held on May 10 also.)

Asked about what there was about Mr. Perkins that the Committee was able to recommend him, Mr. Miller stated: a) he was the proper age - early 50s, b) he had fantastic energy - 60 to 70 hour work week, c) good sense of humor - could laugh at himself, d) knowledge of Washington, e) ability to move with the Washington community - good government contacts, f) former Assistant Secretary of Air Force - friend of Zuckert. g) background for development of adequate science program - best chance to build up the University in graduate and professional school area, h) his statement that he considered his job as President was to energize the deans and faculty to produce ideas. "His job would be to produce money to carry them out."

Asked if Mr. Elliott lacked the above characteristics or was a man of lesser stature. Mr. Miller replied "Yes." Mr. Miller, in response to a question as to what weighed against Mr. Elliott in the Committee's opinion, stated as he had previously: 1) two bad appointments at Maine, 2) question of the transferability of his experience at Maine to Washington.

In reply to a question about which Committee usually took the initiative in various matters, Mr. Miller stated he guessed the only time the Board Committee had taken the initiative was when they asked to meet with the Faculty Committee on Friday, June 4, 1965. Mr. Miller said he guessed they wanted to know the Committee's opinion on Elliott.

Asked about the "criteria" set up by the Faculty Committee to measure candidate qualifications, Mr. Miller reiterated that the Board Committee had never replied to the letter containing them.

Mr. Miller stated that for the first few months the Faculty Committee had worked with good rapport, but later broke down. He also stated that security measures broke down in that rumors and leakages were widespread on the campus.

The meeting adjourned at 1:45 p.m.

In my opinion Elliott did not have the characteristics Perkins had in the same degree as Perkins but that he had more affirmative characteristics than had been made apparent to the Faculty at its meeting on June 7, 1965

29 June 1965

Dr. Thomas McPherson Brown
Chairman, Faculty Committee to
Advise and Consult with the Board of
Trustees on the Selection of a President
The George Washington Hospital

Dear Tom:

I have received a copy of Professor Kayser's letter to you concerning the use by the committee composed of Professors Davison and Kraus and myself of some of the information contained in the files of the Committee to Advise and Consult on the Selection of a President. I have also had a conversation with Professor St. Cyr. My feeling is that the most valid question as to the propriety of our using these files for the task assigned us by the Faculty Assembly relates to a particular type of material. This is material representing information which was given to the Advisory committee with the understanding not only that it would be treated with great discretion but also and very specifically that it would be passed to absolutely no one except members of the Advisory committee. It is hard for me to believe that there is much in the files that was received under such a severe restriction, but we agree that any specific commitments undertaken by the Advisory committee should be honored;

I offer the following comments in the hope that they may lessen any objection to our examination of some of the material in the files of your committee:

1. My committee will certainly attempt to be as conscientious and discreet in using the files as was your committee and will make every effort not to be instrumental in any violation of confidentiality.
2. We are primarily interested in procedure, chronology, and the wording of various memoranda and correspondence exchanged between your committee and the Trustees. In general, we are not interested in expressions of fact or opinion which you received from various sources concerning the qualifications of candidates - except possibly such expressions from members of the Board of Trustees, and we do not propose to try to reassess the qualifications of any candidates including Dr. Elliott. It has always been my position that the Advisory committee and only that committee should act for the faculty in making such assessments.

3. The job put upon the three of us by the Faculty Assembly at its last meeting is not an easy one and we shall greatly appreciate any help the Advisory committee gives us. We are grateful for the very considerable amount we have already received.

Sincerely yours,

Reuben S. Wood,
Chairman